

been quite scarce at points during this pandemic. Simply put, this bill is good for Homeland Security, good for Americans, and good for American businesses.

H.R. 2915 is endorsed by the Warrior Protection and Readiness Coalition and passed out of the committee unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Homeland Procurement Reform Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the HOPR Act, H.R. 2915.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Mr. CORREA, for his continued leadership on this issue to help bolster our domestic supply chains.

This bill requires that, to the maximum extent possible, at least one-third of the funds obligated for the procurement of the Department of Homeland Security uniforms and gear covered by the HOPR Act be used to purchase goods manufactured by entities that qualify as United States small businesses.

Additionally, this bill directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a study of the adequacy of uniform allowances provided to Department frontline personnel to determine what improvements can be made to current uniform allowances, including increasing allowances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in supporting H.R. 2915, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if enacted, H.R. 2915 will simultaneously serve the frontline personnel who protect our homeland and support the domestic industrial base, especially small businesses.

Most importantly, as noted in the committee report, it is our expectation that, once this measure is enacted into law, DHS implement it in a manner that supports small business domestic manufacturing.

To that end, DHS is expected to prioritize buying from small businesses that manufacture the item here in the United States over purchasing foreign-manufactured goods supplied by a small business.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the bipartisan work that went into creating this legislation that is cosponsored by my Republican colleague, Mr. BRIAN MAST of Florida. I also appreciate the efforts of Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire, who introduced the Senate companion of this bill, which the Senate Committee on Homeland Security ordered to be favorably reported this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the HOPR Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2915, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1345

DHS ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD ACT OF 2021

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5652) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5652

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 836. ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department an Acquisition Review Board (in this section referred to as the ‘Board’) to support the Under Secretary for Management in managing the Department’s acquisitions.

“(b) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) CHAIR.—The Under Secretary for Management shall serve as chair of the Board.

“(2) OVERSIGHT.—The Under Secretary for Management may designate an employee of the Department to oversee the operations of the Board.

“(3) PARTICIPATION.—The Under Secretary for Management shall ensure participation by other relevant Department officials with responsibilities related to acquisitions as permanent members of the Board, including the following:

“(A) The Chair of the Joint Requirements Council.

“(B) The Chief Financial Officer.

“(C) The Chief Human Capital Officer.

“(D) The Chief Information Officer.

“(E) The Chief Procurement Officer.

“(F) The Chief Readiness Support Officer.

“(G) The Chief Security Officer.

“(H) The Director of the Office of Test and Evaluation.

“(I) Other relevant senior Department officials, as designated by the Under Secretary for Management.

“(c) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet regularly for purposes of evaluating the progress and status of an acquisition program. The Board shall convene at the Under Secretary for Management’s discretion, and at such time as—

“(1) a new acquisition program is initiated;

“(2) a major acquisition program—

“(A) requires authorization to proceed from one acquisition decision event to another throughout the acquisition life-cycle;

“(B) is in breach of its approved acquisition program baseline; or

“(C) requires additional review, as determined by the Under Secretary for Management; or

“(3) a non-major acquisition program requires review, as determined by the Under Secretary for Management.

“(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Board are as follows:

“(1) Determine the appropriate acquisition level and acquisition decision authority for new acquisition programs based on the estimated eventual total expenditure of each such program to satisfy the mission need of the Department over the life-cycle of such acquisition regardless of funding source.

“(2) Determine whether a proposed acquisition has met the requirements of key phases of the acquisition life-cycle framework and is able to proceed to the next phase and eventual full production and deployment.

“(3) Oversee whether a proposed acquisition’s business strategy, resources, management, and accountability is executable and is aligned with the mission and strategic goals of the Department.

“(4) Support the person with acquisition decision authority for an acquisition in determining the appropriate direction for such acquisition at key acquisition decision events.

“(5) Conduct systematic reviews of acquisitions to ensure that such acquisitions are progressing in accordance with best practices and in compliance with the most recently approved documents for such acquisitions’ current acquisition phases.

“(6) Review the acquisition documents of each major acquisition program, including the acquisition program baseline and documentation reflecting consideration of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives, to ensure the reliability of underlying data.

“(7) Ensure that practices are adopted and implemented to require consideration of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives as part of the process for developing requirements for major acquisition programs prior to the initiation of the second acquisition decision event, including, at a minimum, the following practices:

“(A) Department officials responsible for acquisition, budget, and cost estimating functions are provided with the appropriate opportunity to develop estimates and raise cost and schedule concerns before performance objectives are established for capabilities when feasible.

“(B) Full consideration is given to possible trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives for each alternative.

“(e) DOCUMENTATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The chair of the Board shall ensure that all actions and decisions made pursuant to the responsibilities of the Board under subsection (d) are documented in an acquisition decision memorandum that includes—

“(A) a summary of the action at issue or purpose for convening a meeting under subsection (c);

“(B) the decision with respect to actions discussed during such meeting;

“(C) the rationale for such a decision, including justifications for any such decision made to allow acquisition programs to deviate from the acquisition management policy of the Department;

“(D) any assigned items for further action; and

“(E) the signature of the chair verifying the contents of such memorandum.

“(2) SUBMISSION OF MEMORANDUM.—Not later than seven days after the date on which the acquisition decision memorandum is signed by the chair pursuant to paragraph (1)(E), the chair shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a copy of such memorandum.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ACQUISITION.—The term ‘acquisition’ has the meaning given such term in section 131 of title 41, United States Code.

“(2) ACQUISITION DECISION AUTHORITY.—The term ‘acquisition decision authority’ means the authority, held by the Secretary to—

“(A) ensure acquisition programs are in compliance with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives;

“(B) review (including approving, pausing, modifying, or cancelling) an acquisition program through the life-cycle of such program;

“(C) ensure that acquisition program managers have the resources necessary to successfully execute an approved acquisition program;

“(D) ensure appropriate acquisition program management of cost, schedule, risk, and system performance of the acquisition program at issue, including assessing acquisition program baseline breaches and directing any corrective action for such breaches; and

“(E) ensure that acquisition program managers, on an ongoing basis, monitor cost, schedule, and performance against established baselines and use tools to assess risks to an acquisition program at all phases of the life-cycle of such program to avoid and mitigate acquisition program baseline breaches.

“(3) ACQUISITION DECISION EVENT.—The term ‘acquisition decision event’, with respect to an acquisition program, means a predetermined point within each of the acquisition phases at which the acquisition decision authority determines whether such acquisition program shall proceed to the next acquisition phase.

“(4) ACQUISITION DECISION MEMORANDUM.—The term ‘acquisition decision memorandum’ means the official documented record of decisions, including the rationale for such decisions and any assigned actions, for the acquisition at issue, as determined by the person exercising acquisition decision authority for such acquisition.

“(5) ACQUISITION PROGRAM BASELINE.—The term ‘acquisition program baseline’, with respect to an acquisition program, means a summary of the cost, schedule, and performance parameters, expressed in standard, measurable, quantitative terms, which must be satisfied to accomplish the goals of such program.

“(6) BEST PRACTICES.—The term ‘best practices’, with respect to acquisition, means a knowledge-based approach to capability development that includes—

“(A) identifying and validating needs;

“(B) assessing alternatives to select the most appropriate solution;

“(C) clearly establishing well-defined requirements;

“(D) developing realistic cost estimates and schedules that account for the entire life-cycle of such an acquisition;

“(E) securing stable funding that matches resources to requirements before initiating such development;

“(F) demonstrating technology, design, and manufacturing maturity before initiating production of the item that is the subject of such acquisition;

“(G) using milestones and exit criteria or specific accomplishments that demonstrate the attainment of knowledge to support progress;

“(H) regularly assessing and managing risks to achieving requirements and cost and schedule goals;

“(I) adopting and executing standardized processes with known success across programs;

“(J) establishing an adequate workforce that is qualified and sufficient to perform necessary functions; and

“(K) integrating the capabilities described in subparagraphs (A) through (J).

“(7) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘major acquisition program’ means—

“(A) a Department capital asset, service, or hybrid acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least \$300 million (based on fiscal year 2022 constant dollars) over its life-cycle cost; or

“(B) a program identified by the Under Secretary for Management as a program of special interest.

“(8) NON-MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘non-major acquisition program’ means a Department capital asset, service, or hybrid acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of less than \$300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2022 constant dollars) over its life-cycle.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 835 the following new item:

“Sec. 836. Acquisition Review Board.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, each year, the Department of Homeland Security spends billions of dollars on its major acquisition programs to execute its most critical missions. It acquires systems vital to homeland security, including those used to screen travelers, enhance cybersecurity, and improve disaster response.

However, over the past decade, the Government Accountability Office, or GAO, has repeatedly raised alarms regarding DHS’ management of its acquisition programs.

Earlier this year, the GAO reviewed 24 major acquisition programs that DHS is pursuing. Ten had been in breach of their cost or schedule goals, or both, at some point during fiscal year 2020.

Given the complexity of DHS’ acquisition programs, it is critical that there be a standing oversight body to give major acquisition programs the attention they deserve. At DHS, the Acquisition Review Board is just that body.

H.R. 5652, the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2021, seeks to strengthen the role of the Acquisition Review Board, or ARB, to improve acquisition outcomes at DHS.

The ARB is charged with reviewing major acquisition programs for proper management, oversight, accountability, and alignment with DHS’ strategic functions.

The ARB can intercede when it identifies a program with significant cost, schedule, or performance issues and drive a course correction or even terminate such a program.

Passage of H.R. 5652 will help stabilize oversight within DHS when it comes to major acquisitions, which, according to GAO, is a high-risk activity, by codifying the Board into law.

Most importantly, the bill also authorizes the Board to not only review major acquisitions but also to review certain acquisitions that are valued below \$300 million but are critical to the Department’s success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5652, the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2021.

The Department of Homeland Security invests billions of dollars each year in its major acquisitions. These programs include buying IT systems to help secure our border, Coast Guard cutters to increase marine safety, and tools to help TSA screen travelers more efficiently. These acquisitions, and others, enable the Department to execute its many critical missions.

In fiscal year 2021 alone, DHS planned to spend more than \$7 billion on its major acquisition programs, and ultimately, the Department plans to spend more than \$200 billion over the programs’ entire life cycles.

However, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, and the DHS Office of the Inspector General, OIG, have reported on the longstanding challenges DHS faces in managing its major acquisition programs, which began with the inception of the Department and continue to this day.

For example, in January 2021, GAO reported that of the 24 major acquisition programs it audited, 10 had been in breach of their cost or scheduled goals, or both, at some point during fiscal year 2020.

Also, in 2018, the OIG reported that DHS components have an ongoing tendency to acquire systems before they adequately define their requirements or develop performance measures. We cannot allow this to continue.

Given these challenges and the significant level of DHS investment in these programs, it is important for Congress to ensure that the proper oversight structures are in place. That is exactly what this bill intends to do.

This bill amends the Homeland Security Act to include the DHS Acquisition Review Board, which has already been formed by the Department.

The bill outlines specific responsibilities and parameters for the Board, which it exercises today, including its membership and how often the Board should meet, such as at certain key points in the programs’ life cycles.

The Board is held at the Department level and is chaired by the acquisition

decision authority—normally, the Under Secretary for Management or a designee—and consists of individuals who manage DHS' mission objectives, resources, and contracts.

The Board's primary oversight role is to review major acquisition programs for proper management, oversight, accountability, and alignment with the Department's strategic functions.

The Board keeps acquisition programs accountable to the Department, Congress, and the American taxpayer, most importantly, by doing the following.

First, it ensures that the Department considers tradeoffs between cost, schedule, and performance before approving a program to proceed to the next phase of acquisition.

Second, it determines whether programs are using acquisition best practices.

Third, it requires senior DHS leaders to review the programs' progress and see that the program requirements are being met as they should.

This bill also requires the Board to document the actions and the decisions that it makes, including rationale for its decisions, which are then submitted to the Committee on Homeland Security in the House and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs in the Senate.

In conclusion, this bill simply proposes to codify better oversight, management, and accountability of the Department's acquisitions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congresswoman DEMINGS, for reaching across the aisle and cosponsoring this commonsense bill with me. I also thank Ranking Member KATKO and Representatives GARBARINO, HIGGINS, and MILLER-MEEKS for cosponsoring this bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5652, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5652 strengthens the Acquisition Review Board, one very important mechanism within DHS that can help ensure that acquisition programs are delivered on time and on budget, and in-line with DHS missions.

A version of this bill passed the House in both the 115th and 116th Congresses, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) for sponsoring the legislation in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5652.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSA REACHING ACROSS NATIONALITIES, SOCIETIES, AND LANGUAGES TO ADVANCE TRAVELER EDUCATION ACT

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5574) to require the TSA to develop a plan to ensure that TSA material disseminated in major airports can be better understood by more people accessing such airports, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5574

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "TSA Reaching Across Nationalities, Societies, and Languages to Advance Traveler Education Act" or the "TRANSLATE Act".

SEC. 2. PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan to ensure that TSA material disseminated in major airports can be better understood by more people accessing such airports.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification of the most common languages other than English that are the primary languages of individuals that travel through or work in each major airport.

(2) A plan to improve—

(A) TSA materials to communicate information in languages identified pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) the communication of TSA material to individuals with vision or hearing impairments or other possible barriers to understanding such material.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the plan required under subsection (a), the Administrator of the TSA, acting through the Office of Civil Rights and Liberties, Ombudsman, and Traveler Engagement of the TSA, shall take into consideration data regarding the following:

(1) International enplanement.

(2) Local populations surrounding major airports.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the submission of the plan required under subsection (a), the Administrator of the TSA shall implement such plan.

(e) GAO REVIEW.—Not later than one year after the implementation pursuant to subsection (d) of the plan required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a review of such implementation.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AIRPORT.—The term "airport" has the meaning given such term in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) MAJOR AIRPORTS.—The term "major airports" means Category X and Category I airports.

(3) NON-TRAVELING INDIVIDUAL.—The term "non-traveling individual" has the meaning given such term in section 1560.3 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) TSA MATERIAL.—The term "TSA material" means signs, videos, audio messages,

websites, press releases, social media postings, and other communications published and disseminated by the Administrator of the TSA in Category X and Category I airports for use by both traveling and non-traveling individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5574, known as the TRANSLATE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman VAN TAYLOR of Texas, for once again joining me in introducing this legislation, which will ease TSA's security processing at our Nation's major airports.

The TRANSLATE Act is bipartisan legislation building upon the Transportation Security Administration's ongoing efforts to increase access for non-English speakers, and for those with vision and hearing impairments, as they navigate the security screening process.

It does this by directing TSA to analyze common languages other than English that are spoken by both our international travelers as well as those who reside in the nearby community and then develop and execute a plan to disseminate security information in those languages to ease the screening process.

I represent the heart of Las Vegas Valley, including McCarran International Airport, which is one of the Nation's busiest airports, welcoming passengers from around the country and around the world who come to enjoy all that southern Nevada has to offer.

Navigating our air system can be stressful enough—if you travel back and forth, you know what I mean—for even the most well-seasoned traveler. Removing potential language barriers to ease TSA processing is not only beneficial for those travelers but also for the general public rushing to catch their flights.

Southern Nevada's community is rich in diversity. One of every three Clark County residents speaks a language other than English at home. Nationwide, that number is just over one out of every five residents. Yet, much of what TSA communicates to travelers and transportation workers through signs, announcements, videos, and online content is in English.